BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:)))
JOHN KELLY MANTIS, M.D.) Case No. 06-2011-215009
Physician's and Surgeon's	,)
Certificate No. G 39199)
Respondent))
	Ó

DECISION

The attached Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby adopted as the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California, Department of Consumer Affairs, State of California.

This Decision shall become effective at 5:00 p.m. on October 10, 2014

IT IS SO ORDERED October 3, 2014.

MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA

Kimberly Kirchmeyer

Executive Director

1	KAMALA D. HARRIS		
2	Attorney General of California E. A. JONES III		
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General BENETH A. BROWNE		
4	Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 202679		
5	California Department of Justice 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702		
6	Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-7816 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395		
7	Attorneys for Complainant		
8	BEFORE THE MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA		
9		CONSUMER AFFAIRS CALIFORNIA	
10			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 06-2011-215009	
12	JOHN KELLY MANTIS, M.D. 7 Marin Court	OAH No. 2014040680	
13	Manhattan Beach, CA 90266	STIPULATED SURRENDER OF LICENSE AND ORDER	
14	Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 39199	EICENSE MAD ORDER	
15	Respondent.		
16			
17			
18	IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by and between the parties to the above-		
19	entitled proceedings that the following matters a		
20		RTIES	
21	1. Kimberly Kirchmeyer (Complainant) is the Executive Director of the Medical Board		
22	of California. She brought this action solely in her official capacity and is represented in this		
23	matter by Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General of the State of California, by Beneth A. Browne,		
24	Deputy Attorney General.		
25	2. JOHN KELLY MANTIS, M.D. (Re	espondent) is represented in this proceeding by	
26	attorney Paul Spackman, whose address is 28441 Highridge Rd., Ste. 201, Rolling Hills Estates,		
27	CA 90274.		
28	3. On or about May 7, 1979, the Medi	cal Board of California issued Physician's and	
	11		

Surgeon's Certificate No. G 39199 to Respondent. The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the charges brought in Accusation No. 06-2011-215009 and expired on August 31, 2014.

JURISDICTION

4. Accusation No. 06-2011-215009 was filed before the Medical Board of California (Board), Department of Consumer Affairs, and is currently pending against Respondent. The Accusation and all other statutorily required documents were properly served on Respondent on November 8, 2013. Respondent timely filed his Notice of Defense contesting the Accusation. A copy of Accusation No. 06-2011-215009 is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference.

ADVISEMENT AND WAIVERS

- 5. Respondent has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 06-2011-215009. Respondent also has carefully read, fully discussed with counsel, and understands the effects of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order.
- 6. Respondent is fully aware of his legal rights in this matter, including the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations in the Accusation; the right to be represented by counsel, at his own expense; the right to confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the right to present evidence and to testify on his own behalf; the right to the issuance of subpoenas to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of documents; the right to reconsideration and court review of an adverse decision; and all other rights accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and other applicable laws.
- 7. Respondent voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently waives and gives up each and every right set forth above.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

- 8. Respondent understands that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 06-2011-215009, if proven at a hearing, constitute cause for imposing discipline upon his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate.
 - 9. For the purpose of resolving the Accusation without the expense and uncertainty of

further proceedings, and because Respondent intends to retire from the practice of medicine, Respondent agrees that, at a hearing, Complainant could establish a *prima facie* basis for the charges in the Accusation and that those charges constitute cause for discipline. Respondent hereby gives up his right to contest that cause for discipline exists based on those charges.

10. Respondent understands that by signing this stipulation he enables the Board to issue an order accepting the surrender of his Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate without further process.

CONTINGENCY

- 11. This stipulation shall be subject to approval by the Medical Board of California. Respondent understands and agrees that counsel for Complainant and the staff of the Medical Board of California may communicate directly with the Board regarding this stipulation and surrender, without notice to or participation by Respondent or his counsel. By signing the stipulation, Respondent understands and agrees that he may not withdraw his agreement or seek to rescind the stipulation prior to the time the Board considers and acts upon it. If the Board fails to adopt this stipulation as its Decision and Order, the Stipulated Surrender and Disciplinary Order shall be of no force or effect, except for this paragraph, it shall be inadmissible in any legal action between the parties, and the Board shall not be disqualified from further action by having considered this matter.
- 12. The parties understand and agree that Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile copies of this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order, including Portable Document Format (PDF) and facsimile signatures thereto, shall have the same force and effect as the originals.
- 13. In consideration of the foregoing admissions and stipulations, the parties agree that the Board may, without further notice or formal proceeding, issue and enter the following Order:

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 39199, issued to Respondent JOHN KELLY MANTIS, M.D., is surrendered and accepted by the Medical Board of California.

///

- 1. The surrender of Respondent's Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate and the acceptance of the surrendered license by the Board shall constitute the imposition of discipline against Respondent. This stipulation constitutes a record of the discipline and shall become a part of Respondent's license history with the Medical Board of California.
- 2. Respondent shall lose all rights and privileges as a Physician and Surgeon in California as of the effective date of the Board's Decision and Order.
- 3. Respondent shall cause to be delivered to the Board his pocket license and, if one was issued, his wall certificate on or before the effective date of the Decision and Order.
- 4. If Respondent ever files an application for licensure or a petition for reinstatement in the State of California, the Board shall treat it as a petition for reinstatement. Respondent must comply with all the laws, regulations and procedures for reinstatement of a revoked license in effect at the time the petition is filed, and all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 06-2011-215009 shall be deemed to be true, correct and admitted by Respondent when the Board determines whether to grant or deny the petition.
- 5. If Respondent should ever apply or reapply for a new license or certification, or petition for reinstatement of a license, by any other health care licensing agency in the State of California, all of the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. 06-2011-215009 shall be deemed to be true, correct, and admitted by Respondent for the purpose of any Statement of Issues or any other proceeding seeking to deny or restrict licensure.

ACCEPTANCE

I have carefully read the above Stipulated Surrender of License and Order and have fully discussed it with my attorney, Paul Spackman. I understand the stipulation and the effect it will have on my Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate. I enter into this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently, and agree to be bound by the Decision and Order of the Medical Board of California.

DATED: 9/15/14

JOHN KELLY MANTIS, M.D.

Respondent

1	I have read and fully discussed with Respondent JOHN KELLY MANTIS, M.D. the terms		
2	and conditions and other matters contained in this Stipulated Surrender of License and Order. I		
3	approve its form and content.		
4	DATED: September 4, 2014 Yand Spackman		
5	PAUL SPACKMAN Attorney for Respondent		
6	ENDORSEMENT		
7	The foregoing Stipulated Surrender of License and Order is hereby respectfully submitted		
8	for consideration by the Medical Board of California of the Department of Consumer Affairs.		
9	Dated: September 19, 2014 Respectfully submitted,		
10	KAMALA D. HARRIS		
11	Attorney General of California E. A. Jones III		
12	Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
13	Beneth A Browne		
14	BENETH A. BROWNE Deputy Attorney General		
15	Attorneys for Complainant		
16			
17	LA2013608844		
18	61359837.doc		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

Exhibit A

Accusation No. 06-2011-215009

FILED STATE OF CALIFORNIA MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 1 KAMALA D. HARRIS Attorney General of California 2 E. A. JONES III Supervising Deputy Attorney General 3 BENETH A. BROWNE Deputy Attorney General 4 State Bar No. 202679 California Department of Justice 5 300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702 Los Angeles, CA 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-7816 6 Facsimile: (213) 897-9395 7 Attorneys for Complainant 8 MEDICAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA 9 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Case No. 06-2011-215009 12 JOHN KELLY MANTIS, M.D. 7 Marin Court 13 ACCUSATION Manhattan Beach, CA 90266 14 Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G 39199 15 Respondent. 16 17 18 Complainant alleges: 19 **PARTIES** Kimberly Kirchmeyer (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in her official 20 capacity as the Interim Executive Director of the Medical Board of California, Department of 21 22 Consumer Affairs. On or about May 7, 1979, the Medical Board of California issued Physician's and 23 2. 24 Surgeon's Certificate Number G 39199 to John Kelly Mantis, M.D. (Respondent). The Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate was in full force and effect at all times relevant to the 25 charges brought herein and will expire on August 31, 2014, unless renewed. 26 JURISDICTION 27 This Accusation is brought before the Medical Board of California (Board), 28 3. 1

Department of Consumer Affairs, under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

4. Section 2229 of the Code states, in subdivision (a):

"Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the Division of Medical Quality,¹ the California Board of Podiatric Medicine, and administrative law judges of the Medical Quality Hearing Panel in exercising their disciplinary authority."

- 5. Section 2227 of the Code provides that a licensee who is found guilty under the Medical Practice Act may have his or her license revoked, suspended for a period not to exceed one year, placed on probation and required to pay the costs of probation monitoring, or such other action taken in relation to discipline as the Board deems proper.
 - 6. Section 2234 of the Code, states:

"The board shall take action against any licensee who is charged with unprofessional conduct. In addition to other provisions of this article, unprofessional conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Violating or attempting to violate, directly or indirectly, assisting in or abetting the violation of, or conspiring to violate any provision of this chapter.
 - "(b) Gross negligence.
- "(c) Repeated negligent acts. To be repeated, there must be two or more negligent acts or omissions. An initial negligent act or omission followed by a separate and distinct departure from the applicable standard of care shall constitute repeated negligent acts.
- "(1) An initial negligent diagnosis followed by an act or omission medically appropriate for that negligent diagnosis of the patient shall constitute a single negligent act.
- "(2) When the standard of care requires a change in the diagnosis, act, or omission that constitutes the negligent act described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, a reevaluation of the diagnosis or a change in treatment, and the licensee's conduct departs from the applicable standard of care, each departure constitutes a separate and distinct breach of the

¹ Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2002, the "Division of Medical Quality" or "Division" shall be deemed to refer to the Medical Board of California.

26

27

28

standard of care.

- "(d) Incompetence.
- "(e) The commission of any act involving dishonesty or corruption which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a physician and surgeon.
 - "(f) Any action or conduct which would have warranted the denial of a certificate.
- "(g) The practice of medicine from this state into another state or country without meeting the legal requirements of that state or country for the practice of medicine. Section 2314 shall not apply to this subdivision. This subdivision shall become operative upon the implementation of the proposed registration program described in Section 2052.5.
- "(h) The repeated failure by a certificate holder, in the absence of good cause, to attend and participate in an interview scheduled by the mutual agreement of the certificate holder and the board. This subdivision shall only apply to a certificate holder who is the subject of an investigation by the board."
- Section 2266 of the Code states: "The failure of a physician and surgeon to maintain 7. adequate and accurate records relating to the provision of services to their patients constitutes unprofessional conduct."

FIRST CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Repeated Negligent Acts)

- 8. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (c), of the Code in that Respondent engaged in repeated negligent acts in the care and treatment of a patient. The circumstances are as follows:
 - Patient I.S., a thirty-two year old pregnant woman with at least one prior miscarriage, was admitted at the Antelope Valley Hospital on January 8, 2009,² at 9:15 p.m. for induction of labor because of concerns about her blood pressure.3 After her arrival she was placed on and she remained on Pitocin.⁴ After an hour, by 10:15 p.m., her cervix had

She was full term with an estimated delivery date of January 10, 2009.
 She had hypertension at the end of her pregnancy.
 Pitocin is a drug used to hasten labor. Pitocin's use requires increased monitoring of a fetus to ensure its well-being during the labor process.

dilated to 4 cm. By the next morning at 1:49 a.m., her cervix had dilated to 7 cm. An intrauterine pressure catheter (IUPC) was placed to better monitor her contractions. ⁵ At 3:00 a.m., her cervix had dilated to 8 cm. Pitocin was increased. By 7:50 a.m., her cervix was completely dilated.

- B. Respondent came onto shift and became the physician for I.S. at 8:30 a.m. At that time, an external fetal heart monitor, also referred to as an external fetal Doppler monitor (EFD), was in place. The EFD consistently showed I.S.'s baby's fetal heart rate on a monitor and on printed strips.
- C. Beginning at or around 9:00 a.m., the EFD failed to consistently show I.S.'s baby's fetal heart rate. Respondent was aware by 10:00 a.m. that the EFD was failing to consistently show I.S.'s baby's fetal heart rate. It had clear intermittent gaps. Respondent explained that gaps "happen sometimes during contractions." Respondent took no action to cause adjustment, fixing or replacing of the EFD. Likewise, he took no action to place a fetal scalp electrode (FSE) onto I.S.'s baby to consistently monitor I.S.'s baby's fetal heart rate.
- D. At or around 9:18 a.m., the IUPC suddenly stopped adequately showing I.S.'s uterine contractions. The IUPC did not show normal wave form. It revealed only very shallow plateaus that only possibly represented contractions. Respondent took no action to cause adjusting, fixing or replacing the IUPC. Likewise, he took no action to place an external tocometer to monitor I.S.'s contraction. Respondent believed he obtained sufficient information about I.S.'s contractions from the IUPC.
- E. After 9:00 a.m., in times when the EFD intermittently worked, it showed some decelerations of I.S.'s baby's fetal heart rate. Because the EFD frequently stopped working as the fetal heart rate was slowing, it was unclear when and how quickly I.S.'s baby's fetal

⁵ An intrauterine pressure catheter (IUPC) is also referenced as an internal pressure transducer, a small device placed through the dilated cervix into the amniotic fluid cavity that transmits through a wire to a monitor information about contractions' frequency, duration and intensity.

heart rate recovered back to its baseline.⁶ For this reason and also because the IUPC was not adequately showing I.S.'s uterine contractions, it was not possible for the decelerations to be characterized and properly used as a tool to evaluate I.S.'s baby's fetal well-being.⁷

- F. Respondent was called at 11 a.m. to evaluate the I.S.'s pushing efforts. Although he recalled evaluating I.S. prior to that time, Respondent's first chart note was at 11:11 a.m. He recorded that that the caput was at the introitus, that the patient was pushing and getting tired, and that his plan was to consider vacuum assistance if the vertex descended a little further. Respondent did not record nor recall what the fetal station was at the time but he recalled that during the morning it was continuing to descend. Respondent encouraged I.S. to keep pushing.
- G. During the same timeframe, the attending nurse recorded variable decelerations. Respondent disagreed and saw only normal variability and normal deceleration. He described "very good short term variability" including prompt recovery indicating that the fetus was doing well. He actually didn't see deceleration. When asked to describe the baby's heartbeat in relation to I.S.'s contractions, Respondent described the fetus's baseline

⁶ Additionally, it was unclear how low I.S.'s baby's fetal heart rate was going (whether

and to what extent it became bradycardic).

A variable deceleration is an abrupt (onset to nadir less than 30 sec), visually apparent decrease of 15 or more beats per minute in fetal heart rate with the decrease lasting between fifteen seconds and two minutes. A variable deceleration is severe if it lasts over 60 seconds, if the fetal heart rate falls below 70 beats per minute or has a drop of 60 or more beats per minute lower than the baseline fetal heart rate. Variable decelerations may result from umbilical cord or head compression. They may be related to risks including oligohydramnios, cord prolapse, nuchal cords causing cord stretch or compression, or with head compression associated with rapid descent and maternal valsalva. Repetitive severe variable decelerations with diminished or absent fetal heart rate may indicate hypoxia, inadequate oxygen to the fetus, resulting in hypoxic ischemic encephalopathy and cellular damage in the fetus's central nervous system (the brain and spinal cord).

⁷ Properly monitoring decelerations means evaluating the lowering of the fetal heart rate relative to the timing and strength of the mother's uterine contractions. An "early deceleration" (a good sign for fetal well being) and a "late deceleration" (a bad sign for fetal well being) are the same in that, for both of them, the fetal heart rate gradually decreases from baseline and then returns to baseline in 30 seconds or longer. In an "early deceleration," the nadir (lowest fetal heart rate reached) is at the same time as the peak of the mother's contraction (the highest intensity/most pressure); the onset and depth of an "early deceleration" mirror the onset and intensity of the mother's contraction. In contrast, a "late deceleration" begins after a contraction has already begun and only after the contraction has already peaked does the fetal heart rate reach its lowest point. A late deceleration may be a warning that that the fetal oxygen level is decreasing.

heartbeat as essentially around 120 beats per minute and variability of the fetal heart rate as a "reassuring sign" of fetal well-being.

- H. Up until 11:11 a.m., Respondent saw that there were a number of instances where the recovery or upstroke of the fetal heart rate to the baseline was not recorded by the FHM. He asserted that he could see when the contractions ended and he assumed that the variables were coincident with contractions (that there were not "late decelerations").
- I. At 11:30 a.m., Respondent was bedside and encouraged I.S. to continue pushing.
- J. Between 11:45 and 11:55 a.m., the fetal monitor continued to only intermittently record the fetal heart rate. The maternal heart rate as determined by a pulse oximeter was superimposed on the strip. The fetal heart monitor showed a wandering fetal heart baseline and a prolonged deceleration which progressed into a bradycardia.⁸
- K. At some point when outside of I.S.'s room, Respondent saw on a monitor a two-minute deceleration where the fetal heart rate dropped below baseline, stayed there about two minutes and then came back up to baseline. Respondent assessed I.S. and her fetus in the ten minutes prior to his leaving to perform an emergency operation on another patient. He evaluated I.S. and the EFD tracings for several minutes. He interpreted the tracings to show good variability with no worsening of any variables. The baby appeared to be stable. He recalled assuring himself that the baby was going to be fine for as long as it took him to go do his other procedure and he would come back and re-assess I.S. later.
- L. The nurse documented that at 11:52 a.m., Respondent was at bedside and "was aware of a 2 minute fetal deceleration." Before leaving to perform an emergency procedure on another patient, Respondent told the attending nurse his assessment that the baby appeared to be stable. Respondent had I.S. continue to push and left to perform an emergency operation on another patient.

⁸ Fetal bradycardia refers to an abnormally low fetal heart rate, under 110 beats per minute in a full term fetus. It is commonly associated with intrauterine hypoxia and perinatal asphyxia - inadequate oxygen to the fetus - resulting in hypoxic ischemic encephalopathy and cellular damage in the fetus's central nervous system (the brain and spinal cord).

- M. Respondent indicated that the deceleration meant only that the baby should be watched more closely. Respondent stated that the baby was fine.
- N. At 12:03 p.m., the nurse summoned emergency help from staff and another doctor who applied a fetal scalp electrode and determined that the fetal heart rate was very low, in the 40's. At or around 12:05 p.m., Respondent returned and the other doctor advised Respondent that the baby needed to be delivered immediately. Respondent tried to verify the fetal heart rate. At 12:09 p.m., Respondent called a "Code Pink" for an emergency Cesarean section on I.S. due to an acute drop in the fetal heart rate. At 12:12, I.S. arrived at the operating room and at 12:20 p.m., I.S.'s baby C.S. was delivered by c-section. Baby C.S. showed evidence of severe hypoxic-ischemic encephalopathy and was neurologically injured.
- O. Respondent stated that since January 9, 2009, and the events described above in the labor of I.S. and delivery of her daughter C.S. on January 9, 2009, he had not changed, and would not change, his fetal monitoring practice.
- 9. Respondent was negligent individually and/or collectively as follows:
- A. On January 9, 2009, when the IUPC stopped adequately recording I.S.'s uterine activity, Respondent was negligent when he failed to replace the IUPC or convert back to an external monitor of the contractions.
- B. On January 9, 2009, when the EFD failed to consistently record I.S.'s fetus's heart rate, Respondent was negligent when he failed to take action to adjust, fix, or replace it and when he failed to use a fetal scalp electrode to monitor I.S.'s fetus's heartbeat.
- C. On January 9, 2009, Respondent was negligent, individually and/or collectively, when he failed to: properly interpret the fetal monitoring strips; understand their significance; and take appropriate action based thereon.

SECOND CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Incompetence)

10. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234, subdivision (d), of the Code in that Respondent was incompetent in the care and treatment of a patient. The

circumstances are as follows:

- A. Paragraph 8 above is incorporated herein as if fully set forth.
- B. Respondent's analysis that between 11:00 a.m. and 11:10 a.m. that the baseline of the fetal heart rate was 120 beats per minute, contractions were every three minutes, that variability was present and that there were no variable decelerations was inaccurate. Respondent's assessment of the fetal monitoring strips as "reassuring" and "normal" was inaccurate.
- C. Respondent's contention that he could adequately monitor I.S.'s uterine activity to sufficiently evaluate I.S.'s fetus's well-being is not accurate.
- D. Respondent's assessment of I.S.'s fetus's status at 11:52 a.m. that the baby was "fine" was inaccurate. Respondent's assessment that the deceleration required only that the fetus needed to be "watched more closely" was insufficient.
- E. Respondent's description of an external fetal monitor's measure of "beat to beat variability" was inaccurate since an external fetal monitor does not measure "beat to beat variability."
- F. Respondent's exclusion of and/or failure to recognize variable and/or late decelerations on the monitoring strips showed inappropriate analysis of I.S.'s fetus's well being.
- G. Respondent was incompetent in the care and treatment of I.S. and her fetus in that he had deficient knowledge of fetal monitoring and what changes reflected in the monitoring required analysis and action.

THIRD CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Record Keeping)

- 11. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2266 of the Code in that Respondent failed to maintain adequate and accurate records of the medical services he provided. The circumstances are as follows:
 - A. The facts and circumstances set forth in paragraph 8 above is incorporated here as if fully set forth.

FOURTH CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE 1 (Unprofessional Conduct) 2 Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under section 2234 of the Code in that 12. 3 Respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct. The circumstances are as follows: 4 The facts and circumstances set forth in paragraphs 8 through 11 above are 5 incorporated here as if fully set forth. 6 PRAYER 7 WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, 8 and that following the hearing, the Medical Board of California issue a decision: 9 Revoking or suspending Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate Number G 39199, 1. 10 issued to John Kelly Mantis, M.D.; 11 Revoking, suspending or denying approval of John Kelly Mantis, M.D.'s authority to 2. 12 supervise physician assistants, pursuant to section 3527 of the Code; 13 Ordering John Kelly Mantis, M.D. to pay the Medical Board of California, if placed 3. 14 on probation, the costs of probation monitoring; and 15 Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper. 16 17 DATED: November 8, 2013 18 19 Medical Board of California Department of Consumer Affairs 20 State of California 21 Complainant 22 LA2013608844 23 61119622.docx 24 25 26 27

28